

MINUTES OF THE
MAG 9-1-1 STUDY COMMITTEE MEETING
December 19, 2016
MAG Office Building, Ironwood Room
Phoenix, Arizona

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Chris Brady, City Manager, Mesa, Co-Chair	John Locklin, Battalion Chief, Mesa Fire
Kevin Phelps, City Manager, Glendale, Co-Chair	Roy Minter, Chief, Peoria Police
# Jesse Cooper, Administrator, Communications Bureau, Phoenix Police	* Sylvia Moir, Chief, Tempe Police
* Dan Cotterman, Deputy City Manager, Goodyear	Michelle Potts, PSAP Manager, Chandler Police
* Domela Finnessey, PSAP Manager, Surprise Police	* Larry Rodriguez, Chief, Tolleson Police
	Jay Strebeck, Assistant Chief, Phoenix Fire

* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

Attended by telephone conference call.

+ Attended by videoconference call.

OTHERS PRESENT

Mike Benjamin, MR 9-1-1	John Wayne Gonzales, Phoenix
Ginna Carico, Peoria	# Steve Holliday, Tolleson
Patrick Cutts, Tempe	# Ron Knight
David Dansevicus, MR 9-1-1	Fred McCann, Maricopa County Sheriff's Office
Valerie Day, MAG	Dan McNemee, Phoenix
Miranda DeWitt, Mesa	Frank McCune, Phoenix
George Diaz, Buckeye	Nate Nguyen, MR 9-1-1
Chrisha Elmer, CenturyLink	Ryan Peters, Chandler
Mike Folia, Avondale Police	Nathan Pryor, MAG
Ryan Gish, MAG	Anje Reimer, Peoria Police
Jenna Goad, Glendale	# Tonia Rogers, Tolleson Police
Liz Graeber, MR 9-1-1 Administrator	Carlos Simmonds, CenturyLink
Loretta Hadlock, Glendale Police	Audrey Skidmore, MAG
Jennifer Hagen, Scottsdale Police	Karen Sutherland, Scottsdale Police
Barbara Jaeger, ADOA	Kelly Taft, MAG
Lynn Koliboski, DPS	
Janet Laird, Gilbert	

1. Call to Order

The meeting of the MAG 9-1-1 Study Committee was called to order by Co-Chair Chris Brady, City Manager, Mesa, at 10:05 a.m. He noted that Co-Chair Kevin Phelps, City Manager, Glendale, would be arriving shortly.

Chair Brady noted that Mr. Jesse Cooper, Phoenix Police, was participating via teleconference.

Chair Brady stated that the draft report for agenda item #4 that was previously transmitted was at each place. The report also was available on the counter in the room.

2. Call to the Audience

An opportunity is provided to the public to address the 9-1-1 Study Committee on items that are not on the agenda that are within the jurisdiction of MAG, or non-action agenda items that are on the agenda for discussion or information only. Citizens will be requested not to exceed a three minute time period for their comments. A total of 15 minutes will be provided for the Call to the Audience agenda item, unless the Study Committee requests an exception to this limit. Opportunities for comment on items posted for action are provided at the time the item is heard.

No public comment cards were received.

3. Approval of the November 22, 2016, Meeting Minutes

Chief Roy Minter moved to approve the November 22, 2016, meeting minutes. Chief John Locklin seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

4. Review and Discussion of the Maricopa Region 9-1-1 Draft Report

Mr. Nathan Pryor, MAG Government Relations Manager, stated that Ms. Liz Graeber, Maricopa Region (MR) 9-1-1 Administrator, would provide a high level overview of the draft report for the MAG region's 9-1-1 system. He noted that feedback and comments were welcome.

Ms. Graeber stated that the report documents the direction from the past two meeting presentations and the history of the MAG 9-1-1 system. Sections in the report describe how 9-1-1 began in the Maricopa Region, how the City of Phoenix became the contract agent for MR 9-1-1 (Attachment A), how decisions on 9-1-1 are made in the MAG Region, how funding for 9-1-1 was established in the State of Arizona, the implementation of wireless 9-1-1, the establishment of the Technical Team and development of the self maintenance model, and implementation of wireless call routing.

Ms. Graeber stated that the report includes call volumes. In 2005, 50 percent of calls to 9-1-1 came from wireless telephones and last year, the number increased to 80 percent. Ms. Graeber stated that there are two data centers in the MR 9-1-1 network and the report discusses the different network services for transmitting 9-1-1 calls. She said that the report describes the types of calls received at the PSAPs: landline, wireless, and Voice Over Internet Protocol (VOIP). Ms. Graeber stated that the report includes the Community Emergency Notification System (Reverse 9-1-1) and she added that 130 emergency notifications to citizens have been made so far this year.

Ms. Graeber stated that the report includes a section on 9-1-1 funding, and the gradual decline in the monthly Emergency Telecommunications Excise Tax collections per state statute. She noted that Attachment B is the FCC report on funding sources by state. Ms. Graeber noted that Arizona, at 20

cents per month, is the lowest amount collected in the U.S. She noted that Louisiana and Missouri do not collect monthly fees. Ms. Graeber stated that some states show a lower monthly collection rate than 20 cents, such as the State of Michigan, which collects 19 cents per month, but is supplemented by local taxes, which are in the range of 20 cents to \$1.

Ms. Graeber stated that the draft report includes a section on the 9-1-1 budgeting process, the MR 9-1-1 budget time line, and the budget components. The report includes a narrative on 9-1-1 funding impacts due to lower tax collections and funding sweeps. Ms. Graeber stated that funding suspensions of State 9-1-1 funds are discussed in the report and shown on Attachment C.

Ms. Graeber stated that the ten-year snapshot (2007-2017) of the MR 9-1-1 budget was summarized. It showed the MAG-approved submitted budget, the baseline budget approved by the State, the conditional budget approved by the State but dependent on sufficient funds, the budget amounts submitted by MAG but denied by the State due to the State 9-1-1 fund shortfall, and the actual monies spent. Ms. Graeber noted that a chart showing the growth of call volumes and population compared to the total change in funding received for the MAG region.

Ms. Graeber indicated that the report outlines the vision for the future of 9-1-1 in the MAG region, which includes an Internet Protocol (IP) platform and communications, sending text and videos to 9-1-1, interfacing with vehicle crash notification companies, interfacing with other 9-1-1 systems outside of the State, capability to monitor the system through mobile devices, and interfacing with non-emergency calls made to public safety departments. Ms. Graeber noted one error in the report that would be corrected: the distance between the Phoenix and Mesa network centers was stated as 18 miles and should read 13 miles.

Chair Brady thanked Ms. Graeber for her report and asked if there were questions or comments. He expressed appreciation for the summary and history, which he felt highlighted the strength of the region in that we have a large Central City that has done a lot and helped the entire region be successful. Chair Brady stated that a lot of responsibility has been assumed by the City of Phoenix for efforts such as the 9-1-1 system, and this is a great example of extending infrastructure to make the region stronger. He commended those in the past who implemented the MR 9-1-1 system. Chair Brady stated that there is not another urban center in the State of Arizona with the population density of this region and the demands and sophisticated technology that accompany such a dense region are unique and different from those in other parts of the state.

Chair Brady stated that some time will need to be spent discussing that Arizona is way behind other states. He expressed his concern is the tax collection. Chair Brady asked for confirmation that \$12.3 million was collected in the State in FY 2016 to support 9-1-1.

Ms. Graeber replied that was correct.

Chair Brady stated that during that period, the allocation to the MAG region was \$8.3 million as shown on the table.

Ms. Graeber stated that the \$8.3 million was the baseline budget that was approved. There is also \$3.8 million in conditional funding, which is not allocated until the end of the fiscal year when the State determines the State 9-1-1 fund is sufficient.

Chair Brady stated that the \$8.3 million is more for maintenance and operations and the \$3.8 million is for equipment. Between the two, it is pretty close to the \$12 million that was collected in the region.

Ms. Graeber explained the chart on page 17. They were trying to capture the amounts submitted, the approved baseline budget, the conditional budget, the denied amounts and the actuals amounts. Ms. Graeber stated that any overages not spent by MR 9-1-1 are returned to the State 9-1-1 budget and reallocated to priority projects across the state.

Chair Brady asked that the \$6.1 million for FY 2016 is the final amount that came to MR 9-1-1, and includes any maintenance, operations, and equipment costs.

Ms. Graeber replied that was correct.

Chair Brady asked for clarification of the difference between the \$8.8 million and the \$6.1 million.

Ms. Graeber replied that the region only spent \$6.1 million of the \$8.8 million approved amount.

Chair Brady asked if the region had the capacity to spend more than \$6.1 million, since the approved and conditional totals amounted to approximately \$12 million.

Ms. Graeber stated that the region is required by state statute to include in its budget the wireless cost recovery for 9-1-1 providers. She explained that most wireless companies have opted to not participate in cost recovery. Ms. Graeber said that whether a company will invoice for wireless cost recovery is unknown to the end of the year. If the company does not claim wireless cost recovery, the amount budgeted is returned to the State 9-1-1 fund. Ms. Graeber stated that one carrier that has not officially said if it will claim cost recovery or not and they need to include the amount, which is a little under \$1 million, in the MR 9-1-1 budget.

Chair Brady asked how much of the \$6.1 million was related to maintenance and operations.

Ms. Graeber replied that she would have to go back to her records to get the exact numbers, but it is likely the entire amount went for maintenance and operations because they had no projects that year.

Chair Brady asked if any of the conditional funding was included in the \$6.1 million that was spent by the region.

Ms. Graeber replied no.

Chair Brady noted that the amount returned to MR 9-1-1 was less than 50 percent of the amount of tax collected in the MAG region.

Chair Brady stated that the bigger dilemma is that a case could be made that more money is needed in the region, but it is hard to sell that if the allocation is disproportionate to the amount being paid into the system. It is hard to justify that we need more money when the amount collected is not coming back to the region. Chair Brady stated that state formulas exist to ensure equity in other state funding. He suggested including in the report the formula for how the allocations are made and where the funds are collected to demonstrate to city councils and legislators that this region collects \$2 in taxes for each \$1 it receives back in funding. Chair Brady stated that they will want to know how we are spending the money we receive today before asking for additional dollars. We need to show transparency for how the money is allocated. This needs to be added to the report.

Chair Brady asked for a clarification of cost recovery for wireless carriers.

Ms. Graeber stated that when the Legislature started planning for the implementation of Phase II wireless, all cell towers had to be retrofitted to deliver location information of 9-1-1 callers to the PSAPs. She added that this retrofit and the test 9-1-1 calls in 2005 came at a cost to the carriers. Ms. Graeber stated that thousands of 9-1-1 wireless test calls were made. She indicated that when the 9-1-1 excise tax was raised to 37 cents in anticipation of Phase II implementation, language for cost recovery was included in the statute so that carriers could be reimbursed for their costs. Ms. Graeber noted that the cost recovery amount is a part of the baseline budget. She added that at the beginning, all carriers required cost recovery, but most now consider it a cost of day to day business and absorb the cost. Ms. Graeber stated that MR 9-1-1 budgets approximately \$1.3 million per year for cost recovery.

Chief John Locklin asked for clarification that MR 9-1-1 does not have the opportunity to spend the \$1.3 million on other budgeted items because it needs to wait and see if a wireless company will submit an invoice at the end of the year. Effectively, that \$1.3 million is unable to be spent.

Ms. Graeber replied that was correct. She added that the unspent funds go back to the State 9-1-1 fund to be reallocated to priority projects in the state.

Chair Brady requested a three-year breakdown of the allocations by the State 9-1-1 Office. It would be beneficial to have transparency of how and where the funds are being spent. He indicated that he and Chair Phelps would be meeting with the State and perhaps some vendors in the new year. Chair Brady requested that staff assist in effectively distributing the draft report throughout the region to affected parties for comment. After the meetings and comments are concluded, the next draft report could be discussed at a meeting the end of January or beginning of February. The report needs to show these are the points that need to be addressed, such as the rate of the collection, the base of collection, how it is collected, what it is collected on, the transparency of how allocations of dollars are made and how to reconcile the collection of revenue with the distribution of revenues.

Mr. Pryor noted that comments on the draft report could be solicited by the January 13-17 timeframe. The next Study Committee meeting could be in late January or early February to discuss the next version of the draft report. Agenda items could include next steps, policy considerations, reporting to the MAG committees, including up to the Regional Council, maybe in the February/March timeframe.

Chair Brady noted that he and Chair Phelps could discuss this with their colleagues at the East Valley and West Valley Managers meetings followed by committee meetings through Regional Council. He stated that an important part of this topic is awareness and understanding of the system before a solution can be found.

5. Request for Future Agenda Items

Topics or issues of interest that the Study Committee would like to have considered for discussion at a future meeting were requested.

No requests were noted.

6. Comments from the Study Committee

An opportunity was provided for Study Committee members to present a brief summary of current events. The Study Committee is not allowed to propose, discuss, deliberate or take action at the meeting on any matter in the summary, unless the specific matter is properly noticed for legal action.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:40 a.m.